

**STYLISTIC DEVICES IN THE “KUTADGU BILIG” AND THE  
ADEQUACY OF THEIR TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH  
(ON THE MATERIAL OF ENGLISH TRANSLATION  
MADE BY W. MAY)**

**KASIEVA, Aida**  
KIRGIZISTAN/KYRGYZSTAN/КЫРГЫЗСТАН

**ABSTRACT**

The XIth century was the “Gold epoch”, the epoch of surprising cultural renaissance for Turkestan. The time gave us a lot of scholars of genius, immortal poets, great architects, philosophers.

“**Kutadgu Bilig**” by Yusuf Balasagun (completed 1070 A. D.) is regarded to be one of the first written literary monuments of the Turkic people.

Unfortunately, we know not so much about the author of the poem. However, there are short data can be found in both of the forewords to the poem; the first of which is written in prose and the second in verses.

Yusuf Balasagun was an outstanding poet, a highly-educated person, wise connoisseur of the human soul, philosopher, scholar of encyclopedic knowledge. He was a master of all nuances of Arabic and Persian poetries and the Turkic folklore as well. Besides, he was an expert in astronomy, mathematics and medicine.

According to literary genre “**Kutadgu Bilig**” is an epic work of ethic and didactic character written with the purpose of showing the way to wisdom of ruling, everyday relationship and life with all its moralistic features, “KB” can not be regarded as a collection of bare ethic and didactic directions and admonitions. This is a philosophic work analyzing the purport and importance of human life and establishing duties and standards of human behaviour.

The poem reflects in an artistically transfigured form the characters, events, moral and ethic ideals connected with life, culture and ideology of the Turkic settled state which still keeps in memory its nomadic prehistory. Of course, in his instructive allegories Yusuf projects the ideal images of people into the background consisting of real human beings, such as Kyuntogdy- elik [Rising-Sun], that is the ruler who personifies Justice; Aitoldy [Full-Moon], that is a vizier who personifies Happiness; Ogdylmish [Praiseworthy], that is a son of the vizier who personifies Wisdom. Ogdurmish [Awakener], that is a relative of the vizier who personifies Modesty.

These four intransient and highly valuable essentials: Justice, Happiness, Wisdom and Modesty are the fundamental factors of the poem.

Although the poem is written in ancient Turkic language that is not spoken nowadays, it has been translated into many languages of the world. Hence, translators face big problems connected with the text, its style, its lexical style in particular. The problem requires special philological knowledge and high linguistic sensibility, which can be achieved as a result of wide reading and the level of his erudition. Pointing out the importance of translation of poetry, the theorist and expert of literary translation V. Koptilov confirms: “A translator of poetry should be sensible about the ties of the content and the form, he should know the limit within which he is able to change the form, in order not to ruin the whole content”. (10) (Translated by us)

On the other hand, highly – qualitative translation of the work is possible only in case of absolute conformity of both contents, as of stylistic and the content of the translated text.

Talking about the style of “**Kutadgu Bilig**” one can not mention about the stylistic devices or tropes, because in the very question lots of problems are noticed while translating metaphors and simile of KB.

The aim of the present article is to compare and see how adequate the translation of the stylistic devices into English has been made.

**Key Words:** Yusuf Balasagun, **Kutadgu Bilig.**

---

Cultural and historic situation in modern world is characterised by deep tendency to the interaction of cultures of different nations, states and even continents, which shows growth of the interest to literary heritage of different nationalities.

The book under review is a translation of the Kutadgu Bilig, the oldest monument of Islamic Turkic literature, dating from the eleventh century. The KB is a long didactic poem consisting of more than 6.500 couplets. Its language is the Karakhanid Turkic, the language of the Manichaeian and Buddhist works of the ninth and tenth centuries.

According to literary genre the KB is an epic work of ethic and didactic character written with the purpose of showing the way to wisdom of ruling, everyday relationship and life. With all its moralistic features, KB can not be regarded as a collection of bare ethic and didactic directions and admonitions. This is a philosophic work analyzing the purport and importance of human life and establishing duties and standards of human behaviour.

KB has come down to us in three manuscripts. The oldest of these copies is the Fergana manuscript, which was probably written in the thirteenth century. The Cairo manuscript seems to have been copied in the fourteenth century. The third copy of KB, the Herat or Vienna manuscript, is in the Uighur script and was copied in the fifteenth century, more precisely in 1439. This manuscript was obviously copied from a manuscript in the Arabic script.

The critical edition of KB was published by Reşid Rahmeti Arat in 1947 (Arat, 1947) in accordance with all three versions. In 1959, Arat also published its translation into modern Turkish. (Arat, 1959) Walter May's English translation is based on a Russian full poetic translation by S.N. Ivanov, and was published under the title "Благодатное знание" («Beneficent knowledge» by "Knowledge" publishers, Moscow, in 1983). Later it was republished in 1990 by «Soviet writer» Leningrad Section (Баласагунский, 1990). From the very edition the present English translation has been made (1996) (Yusuf Balasaguni, 1996).

**This paper is a part of a study that aims to explore the stylistic nature of the Kutadgu Bilig and compare how adequate they were translated into English.**

Here it is necessary to mention about the theory of translation itself and the compatibility as well as applicability of stylistic devices with the considered material.

As a matter of fact, we deal with the poetic work written in ancient Turkic which is not spoken nowadays. Hence, the role of translator is very important. He is made great demands of, especially concerning the text, its style, its lexical and syntactical styles, in particular. That is why the role of translation and the translator should be highlighted.

Pointing out the importance of translation of poetry, the theorist and expert of literary translation V. Koptilov confirms: «A translator of poetry should be sensible about the ties of the content and the form, he should know the limit within which he is able to change the form, in order not to ruin the whole content». (Koptilov, 1972; translated by us).

On the other hand, highly – qualitative translation of the work is possible only in case of absolute confirmity of both contents, as of stylistic and the content of the translated text.

To enhance the communicative effect of his message the author of the source text (ST) may make use of various stylistic devices (SD), such as Metaphor, Simile, Metonymy, Epithet, etc. Coming across a stylistic device, the translator has to make up his mind whether it should be preserved in his translation or left out and compensated for some other place.

More complicated is the problem of translating individual figures of speech created by the imagination of the ST author. They are important elements of the author's style and are usually translated word for word. Nevertheless, the original image may prove unacceptable in the target language (TL) and the translator will have to look for a suitable occasional substitute.

As it is known, figurativeness, picturesqueness of the work is achieved by means of different SD. The translator is to use all the wealth, richness of the language. He should carefully consider all the details, which make an artistic impression in order not to forfeit the rendering of vividness, brightness, and individual peculiarities of the original text. However, the translator should not blindly copy every detail, if it is contrary to stylistic norms of his language. If it is necessary, a translator has a right to substitute one SD for another which will produce similar effect. Some SDs may be ignored by the translator when their expressive effect is insignificant and their reproduction in the target text would run counter to the spirit of TL. A well known scientist and translator G. Gachechiladze compares translator's work with the sculptor's strenuous efforts to make a lifelike statue out of a stone. It is not a mere technique and handicraft but art also. (Гачечиладзе, 1972: 52)

Concerning this issue, many scholars are at variance with the typology of SD. At the same time it is difficult to deny that SD must be observed on different levels: phonetic, morphemic, lexical, phraseological and syntactical. I. Galperin adds the utterance level. (Galperin, 1971: 26)

First of all let us determine what SD proper is. This term is suggested by I. Galperin who considers SD «a conscious and intentional literary use of some of the facts of the language (including expressive means) in which the most essential features (both structural and semantic) of the language forms are raised to a generalized level». (Galperin, *Ibid.*; 28) Needless to say that most SD may be regarded as aiming at the further intensification of the emotional or logical emphasis. This conscious transformation of language units into a Stylistic Device has been observed by certain linguists whose interest in scientific research have gone beyond the boundaries of grammar. Thus, A. Potebnya writes, «As far back as in Ancient Rome and Greece and with few exceptions up to the present time the definition of the figurative use of a word has been based on the contrast between ordinary speech used in its own, natural, primary meaning and transferred speech». (Потебня, 1990; 158) In other words, the main constituting feature of a SD is the opposition of two meanings of the applied unit, one of which is normatively fixed in the language and does not depend on the context while the other one originates in the certain context. I. Galperin calls this phenomenon Interaction as far as Lexical level is concerned. His typology mainly consists of two major groups:

1. Lexical level of SD
2. Syntactical level of SD

The system we are going to follow in writing the present paper will mostly belong to the first, i.e. Lexical level of stylistic devices in the **Kutadgu Bilig**.

### *Lexical Stylistic Devices in the Kutadgu Bilig*

Yusuf, who made his name immortal, was born in Balasagun and the poet's second name originates there. Nothing but the name is left from the town of Balasagun which had been situated on the territory of the today's Kyrghyzstan, on both banks of the river Chu.

As a poet Yusuf was a master of all nuances of Arabic and Persian poetics and Turkic folklore. Born at the junction of cultures, "Kutadgu Bilig" united the spiritual achievements of several literary traditions: Persian – Tadjic, Arabic, Greek-Persian, Hindu – Buddhist. Harmony of the book is a result of the Turkic cultural tradition incarnated in echoes of the steppe-based lyric poetry of nomadic authors, in real Turkic names of characters, in the rich depository of the people's wisdom, verbal poetic works of Ancient Turkic peoples, their proverbs and sayings which Yusuf interspersed into his poem. And the role of stylistic devices in making the language of the Kutadgu Bilig beautiful is great. The poem comprises lots of tropes related both as to Linguistics and Literature. Almost every its couplet is provided with some of the SDs. The most wide spread among them are – **Simile, Metaphor, Metonymy and Epithet**. And the paper focuses on them. It is undoubtedly clear that every stylistic phenomenon is of a high importance for us, but it is not possible to analyze all of them within the limits of one research. That is why we considered that it is quite reasonable to deal with the most frequently used of them. As it was mentioned by F.C. Prescott: "Emotion and expressivity are most intensely conveyed by use of semantic stylistic means" (Prescot, 1953; 122). Thus the literal use of language treats reality in the true light of its existence while the figurative use of language treats reality in the terms of an individual imagination, feeling and attitude. In other words literal language states facts and ideas, figurative language unfold their emotional and expressive interpretations. The figurative use of language evokes an individual emotional response to reality.

One more important moment should be taken into consideration while dealing with lexical peculiarities of the work under review. It is obvious, that it is not possible to interpret stylistic devices in the very level as it has been produced by the author. The reason of that is: "Смысл и выразительные средства нам не доступны только отчасти, именно в их трафаретной части, а индивидуальная окраска исчезает в перспективе веков." (Ларин, 1974: 285).

The stylistic devices of KB have been structurally distinguished into three groups within Lexical Stylistic Devices:

## I. Stylistic Devices based on Intensification of a Certain Feature of a Thing or Phenomenon

In this group of SD one of the qualities of the object is made to sound essential.

### *Simile in the Kutadgu Bilig*

«Simile is a figure which draws a comparison between two different things in one or more aspects.» (Geniusas, 1972; 81) For instance in the couplet 5639,

5639 *saçım boldı songkur tüşi teg şaşut*  
*sakal boldı yazkı gülef teg orut*

(songkur is “a merlin”: *saçım boldı songkur tüşi teg şaşut* / *sakal boldı yazkı gülef teg orut* – *lit.* my hair became ash-grey like a merlin, / and my beard got faded like a summer grass) (OTD, p. 508)

*gülef* – name of the herb with flowers like a rose (QBN 404: OTD p.195)

### In Russian translation this couplet says:

5639 *Увы, голова, словно кричит, седа,*  
*Подобно засохшей траве борода*

W. May translates:

5639 *Alas, now my head is as grey as an ash;*  
*My beard is like dry autumn grasses, alas!*

I. Galperin warns that ordinary comparison and simile must not be confused. He writes, “They represent two diverse processes. Comparison means weighing two objects belonging to one class of things with the purpose of establishing their sameness or difference. To use a Simile is to characterize one object by bringing it into contact with another object belonging to an entirely different class of things.” (Galperin, *Ibid.*; 164)

Consequently, it is easily seen in the above-mentioned couplet of the poem: *saç* – “hair” and *songkur* – “a merlin”; *sakal* – “beard” and *gülef* – “grass” are objects coming from different classes of things.

As it has been said, Simile is one of the most widely used SD in KB. Among all 6.500 couplets, Simile is seen in more than 243 of them. Giving the definition to Simile and emphasizing its importance A. Kvjatkovsky says: “Сравнение является начальной стадией, откуда в порядке градации и разветвления вытекают почти все остальные тропы – параллелизм, метафора, метонимия, синекдоха, гипербола, литота и прочие. В сравнении – истоки поэтического образа.” (Квятковский, 1966; 280)

The structure of Simile in the reviewed text is quite diversified. This fact allows us to describe some of them and due to the fact that it is not possible to analyze each, we made up our minds to give just examples of their translation into English via Russian.

On the morphological level, English simile has formal elements in its structure. They are connective words like: **like, as, such as, as if, seem**. Simile in KB is mostly given by means of addition of the connective word – *teg*, which is more precise to translate as “as”; “like” etc. This linguistic phenomenon does not exist in every modern Turkic language as a certain word. However, in Modern Turkish language it is equal to *gibi*. In Kyrgyz simile is expressed by adding of such affixes like **-тай, -той, -тей, -дай, -дой, -дей** to the root of the noun and formally are similar to **-leyü (-layu)** in KB. But similes constructed this way are better to be characterized as Metaphorical Epithets. (See in the Epithet)

Now let us observe the translation of – *teg* into English. **For example:**

*bodum erdi ok teg köngül erdi ya  
köngül kıldı ok teg bodum boldı ya (371: 1099)*

(*Lit.* As straight as an arrow my body was, and as a bow my heart was/now my heart is straight as an arrow, and my figure became as bent as a bow)

*Был прям, как стрела, я – как лук, окривел.  
А в сердце, как лук трепетавшем, – прострел. (371)*

*I was straight as an arrow, now bent like a bow.  
In my heart were no fears, only now do they grow. (371)*

**Or in another couplet:**

*bu tüş teg tiriglik keçer belgüsiz  
kerek beg kerek kul barır kelgüsiz (1396, 5845)*

(*Lit.* this dreamy life (life like a dream) will pass/and a king and a slave will irretrievably cross).

*Вся жизнь, словно виденный сон, быстротечна,  
И – раб или бек – все уходят навечно. (1396)*

*All life is just seen, as a swift – flowing dream,  
And Bey be, or slave, you will cross Lethe’s stream. (1396)*

(Lethe – a river of oblivion in the underground kingdom).

The combinations in the mentioned couplets “ok teg” and “tüş teg” are repeated many times in the poem. The following couplet may serve as example. Yusuf in chapter 30, describing what features and qualities a war-chief should possess says:

*tonguz teg titimlig böri teg küçi*  
*adıglayu azgır kutuz teg öçi* (2311)

According to the sources taken from **Old Turkic Dictionary** (OTD) it is translated as: toņuz **teg** titimlig böri teg küçi [he must be] stubborn (persistent) as a boar, and strong as a wolf (QBN 174) (OTD 556). adıglayu agsun/ azgır - [be fierce as a bear] (QBH; 86) (OTD; 10), (QBK; 123), (OTD; 72); *qutuz teg öçi* – his anger [must be] like [anger] of a deer (QBN; 174), (OTD; 475).

**The Russian translation of the couplet 2311:**

*Кабанье упорство и волчий бросок,*  
*Медвежью свирепость, олений наскок.*

**The English version of this couplet is as follows:**

*A wild boar's attack, and a wolf's stealthy creep,*  
*A brown bear's full fury, a swift reindeer's leap.* (2311)

Here, we can see how simile in original text changes into metaphor excluding words like: **such as**, **like**, **as** and figuratively depicts the features of the hero or warrior. The same idea is also noticed in the next couplet:

*yana alçı bolsa kızıl tilki - teg*  
*titir buğrası teg kör öç sürse keg.* (2312)

(yana alçı bolsa kızıl tilki - **teg** - and also [he should be] cunning as a red fox (QBN; 174); (OTD; 34) / titir buğrası teg kör öç sürse kek -[he must] flow into a fury, as a male- camel. (QBN; 123); (OTD; 120).

**In Russian:** *Вотель, как лисы, будь хитростью лют,*  
*И яростен, словно взбешенный верблюд.* (2312)

**The English translation is as follows:**

*With fox's cute cunning the foe he should fight,*  
*With mad camel's temper and spitting with spite!* (2312)

Again, the conversion of simile into metaphor can be seen from the mentioned couplets. They are: *tonguz teg titimlig, böri teg küçi, adıglayu azgır, kutuz teg, kızıl tilkü teg alçı, bugra teg, kuzgun teg, ügi teg usuz* are considered to be accepted as set expressions.

Consequently, the way of building similes in KB syntactical level is characterized by using definite words;

**1. Teg** Except the above-mentioned examples with **-teg**. It is given with **concrete nouns** such as: ay, tengiz, ok, kız, keyik, kış, çiçek, neng, yek – (“devil” in OTD), bulıt, çadan, köçüt, aş, şeker, qum, kömür, taş tişi, kevel, kün-yaşık, yüz, ud, tilkü, jahan, büka etc; with **abstract nouns** such as: ün (77), agın (775),

tüş (231, 1132, 1396, 1399, 5146, 5848), kimya (310), könike (1499), yıl (693, 1274), ot (2687, 3107), yalın (2289, 5679), jan (4120, 6537), tüs (5639, 5643), belgü (6356), yaz (6531).

However, **-teg** also makes similes in combination with personal names, most of which are connected with Islamic religion: Şeddad-u ad teg (6547), Nuşin revan teg (6550), Ashab-I res teg (6551) etc.

Totally, we have counted nearly 120 cases of using **-teg** in KB.

**2. Sanı.** There are not so many examples of Simile with the affix **-sanı** and, they can be seen in nearly twenty (20) cases. It has the same translation as **-teg**.

**For instance,**

1916 sözüg sözlemese sav **altun sanı** (simile)  
bakır boldı tildin çıkarsa anı (metonymy)

(lit. if the word is not said, it is like a gold / it will turn to a copper the moment it's told)

**Ivanov translates the couplet the following way:**

He сказано слово – оно **словно** злато, (simile)  
А выскочет- медью блестит тускловато! (metonymy)

**In May's translation:**

A word that's unspoken just glitters like gold, (simile)  
But turns to dull copper the moment it's told! (metaphor)

**3. Mesel.** This word is considered to be borrowed from Arabic and etymologically it takes its roots from the word «maqal» – «proverb», «saying». (OTD; 339) Apart from this meaning, it has the second one – «as an example». Totally it can be seen in five couplets of KB. For example, couplet 2885.

**4. -tuşı.** It is very close to “mesel” in meaning. However, the Old Turkic Dictionary offers the following notions of the word: 1. Time; moment. 2. Instead. (OTD; 590)

There are four cases of using this word in KB. F.eg., couplet 3165.

**5. Ol.** This word is used quite frequently and we have counted more than 110 cases of its usage in KB. For instance, *ukuş ol burunduk* (159), *esizlik ot ol* (249), *bilik baylık ol çıgay bolgusuz* (313), *ukuş ol sanga edgü andlig adaş* (317), *tüşün ol bu dünya* (1202), *ukuşsuz kişi ol yemişsiz yıgaç, oğul kız yağı ol yağı ne kerek* (3380).

Distinquishing similes on syntactical level, another five affixes have been found in KB: **tegü** (5142) in the meaning “as”, “like”; **sakışı** (3526) in the same meaning; **bol** is used more often than the previous ones and can be met in 50

couplets of KB. Among them as *bolur* in 23 cases, *boldı* in 18 cases (157, 1126, 1988, 2039, 2293, 2383, 3880, 1439, 2097, 2140, 3005, 3871, 4347, 2143, 3571 etc.); *Turur-* as an auxiliary affix in simile in the meaning of “as”, “like”: 164, 179, 654, 2795, 3394, 4733, 6134, 670, 614 etc.; *kör* (2206); *tut* (2450); *erdi* (3394, 1393, 35, 408); *bu* (162, 1164, 1170, 4768).

## II. Interaction of Dictionary and Contextual Logical Meanings Metaphor in The *Kutadgu Bilig*

“A Metaphor is a relation between the dictionary and contextual meaning based on similarity of certain properties or features of the two corresponding concepts.” (Galperin, Ibid.; 136) Metaphor is usually called a compressed or hidden simile.

### For example:

4618 *ölümdin yumuşçı ig ol aşnısı*  
*kişi igledimü ölüm koşnısı*

*ölümka yumuşçı ig ol aşnısı* – the very first servant of death is a sickness (QBN 131); (OTD; 280)

(*lit.* illness is the first servant of death / the moment a man falls ill, the death is his neighbour)

*Болезнь – весть о смерти, примета примет,*  
*Всем болезням смерть – самый близкий сосед.*

*For illness is but the precursor of death,*  
*And sickness and death breathe the one same foul breath!*

Here, metaphor is used in the both lines of the couplet to describe the fact that illness brings death. The example above may serve as an illustration of genuine metaphors which are absolutely unexpected or quite unpredictable.

As it was written by V. Kukharenko: «The expressiveness of the Metaphor is promoted by the implicit simultaneous presence of images of both objects (concepts): the one which is actually named and the one which supplies its own «legal» name. The wider the distance between these two objects the more striking and unexpected is the Metaphor.» (Kukharenko, 1986; 40)

In the *Kutadgu Bilig* Yusuf as a great master could find similarities between quite different objects and phenomena. We can see this in the way that the meaning of some words is described with the help of others; difficult concepts are conveyed through simple metaphors. The problem here is to find out the object of comparison, which was omitted by the poet on purpose as the nature of the trope requires it.

Metaphor as one kind of a tropic system of the language can describe emotional, physical, psychical, mental state of the person and make everything live: objects, phenomena, animals or plants acquire on human characteristics.

The major part of the metaphoric potential of the KB is formed by “animation” of the objects or phenomena.

Consequently, the classification of the semantic structure of metaphors in the KB can be subdivided into two major semantic types:

1. Acquisition of the features of animate object or phenomenon by inanimate ones. (Animation to inanimate).

2. Acquisition of the features of animate object or phenomenon by animate ones. (Animation to animate).

**I. The Animation of inanimate objects.** This is the most frequently used semantic type of metaphor in the KB. For instance, the couplet 3949 says:

3949 *kalik bütrü tuttî kara kuş öngi*  
*ajun barça toldî kara kuş yüngi*

(*lit.* The whole sky took the black bird’s colour, And the whole world is filled with its plumes).

According to the notes given in the Old Turkic Dictionary it is translated as: **ajun barça toldî qara quş jüñi** – the whole world is full of eagle’s plums (QBN; 285); (OTD; 286)

Here we can see that the **sky** as well as the **world** acquired the features of a **bird**. What about the translation of the couplet into Russian and English?

3950 *Орлиная тьма небеса облегла*  
*Взъерошен весь мир словно перья орла.*

The underlined word “**словно**” – “**as**” in the second half of the couplet shows that instead of using metaphor such stylistic device as simile is used.

As for English version by W. May, as it was translated from Russian, the same trope as in Russian has been used:

3950 *The heavenly darkness above his head looms –*  
*Dishevelled the sky, **as it were** eagle’s plumes*

There is another example concerning the same category of metaphor in the couplet 3953:

3953 *yaşik koptî yirdin kötürdi başın*  
*yaruk yüz küler teg yirişti tişin*

(*lit.* The sun rose, raised its head from the beneath of the Earth, **As if** a smiling face showed [its] teeth.)

jaşıq qoptı jerdin kötürdi başın – the sun rose, raised its head from the beneath of the Earth. (QBN 285); (OTD; 457)

The English version translated by W. May is as follows:

3954 *The new sun then spread its first rays on the ground;  
Its pearly-bright smile lit the earth all around.*

This kind of animation of concrete objects, as we mentioned before, can be viewed very often in the KB: ( **For example:** 70; 3952; 80; 4912):

70 *tümen tü çiçekler yazıldı küle* – [thousands of flowers smilingly blossomed]

80 *kalik kaşı tügdi közi yaş saçar* – [the sky frowned, its eyes burst into tears]

4912 *hava nefis tirilse ölü bu köngül* – [if passion starts living, the soul will die].

The metaphorized combination **köngül ölü**–“soul (heart) dies” can also be seen in the following couplets of the poem: 4912, 4913, 5689

The next category of metaphors of the first semantic group deals with the words **bilig**–“intellect, wit” and **ukuş**–“mind.” These abstract concepts also acquire the features of animate objects such as: Bey (beg); Khan.

5321 *bilig beg bolup kör ukuş bolga han.* – [your wit is a Bey, and Khan is your mind]

5322 *Your mind is a Bey, and Khan is your sense!* (W. M.)

Another long list of metaphors dealing with animation of abstract objects can be shown by the word combinations with **köngül** – “soul”; “heart.”

**a) köngli kadgurar** (3329) – “soul is sad, pity”

3329 *Kadaş köngül barça sanga kadgurar* –[every relative’s heart pities (is broken) for you]

*körü idsa bulmaz köngül yilgürer* – [how can not they become sad seeing you so?]

This couplet describes the scene when Ogdylmish (Wisdom), a son of the vizier tries to persuade Ogdurmish (Modesty) to return to his relatives.

3329 *We relatives pity you, each one of us;*

*How, seeing you so, could we fail to do thus?* (W. M.), (No metaphor)

**b) köngli kılma baş** – “don’t let your soul head you” in the meaning “not to follow the fury” in the couplets: 3965, 4273, 5773, 3826, 4584:

3965 *manga buşmagıl sen köngül kılma baş* - [Don't worry for me then and follow the fury]

3966 *Don't trouble your heart so, make me troubled too! (W. M.)*

c) *köñül korksa* – “if the heart is afraid, feared”. This metaphor is seen in the very chapter where Yusuf describes the qualities the Bey should possess. He says the Bey needs thousands of good qualities, but at the same time he should be careful as well:

1986 *sakınlık kişi köngül korkluk bolur* – [a careful person has a sensitive heart]

*köngül korksa begler işig tüz kılur* - [if the Bey has it, he can do everything with the very right start]

1986 *For sensitive hearts are most easily harmed,  
And trembling hearts by full justice are charmed (W. M.)*

From the semantic point of view, the first half of the couplet of W. May's translation does not match the original text. If we have metaphor (*sakınlık kişi köngül korkluk bolur*) - [a careful person has a sensitive heart] in the original text, in English text we have: “for sensitive hearts are most easily harmed.”

Apart from the metaphors with the word *köngül* – “soul”; “heart” which is given to describe the features of animate objects, another words of the same category are also used in the KB. They are: *ajun, dunja* – “world”; *näfs* – “passion” (5322); *ölüm* “death” in the couplets 4834; 1200; 1142.

5322 *bu dünya yağı ol bu nefsing yağı* [the enemy of the world is the enemy of your passion]

5323 *This world's not your friend, and your passion's your foe. (W. M.)*

However, there is only case in the poem when features of animate objects are given to inanimate ones: if before we talked only about nouns, now it concerns numerals:

366 *okır emdi altmış mangar kel tiyü* [finally, my sixty tells me to come]

366 *My sixth decade now calls me “Come on!” instead. (W. M.)*

Thus, we have considered the way the specific and abstract concepts and objects are given the features of animate objects from the semantic point of view.

II. The metaphorical combinations in which animate objects or concepts are provided by the features of animate ones are collected in this (II) type of metaphors. For example:

a) Birds are given the qualities and abilities of the person:

*75 ular kuş ünin tüzdi ünder işin  
silig kız okır teg köngül birmişin*

**Ular** quş ünin tüzdi ündär eşin - [male] partridge's voice has changed, calls his friend [female]. (QBN) (OTD; 609).

As for the first half of the couplet where metaphor is (ular kuş ünin tüzdi – partridge has tuned up). It is seen in the chapter 4 “*About the brilliant spring bringing glory and praise to the worthy all- conquering victor of truth and faith the great ruler Tabgach-Bogra-Kara-Khan, whose father was Ali-Khasan, son of Arslan Khan. May God's blessing fall upon them all.*” In this chapter Yusuf compares the rule of Tabgach-Bogra-Kara-Khan with the beautiful spring using metaphors.

According to the couplet 75 given as original, the bird is given the person's ability to tune up, whereas from the translation of the same couplet in the Old Turkic Dictionary given in Namangan version “[male] partridge's voice has changed, calls his friend [female].” A few words also should be said about the bird “**ular**.” Actually, this bird is not a partridge, but a black grouse (black-cock), which is very popular in Muslim world because it is a symbol of happiness and longevity. That is why there is a Kyrgyz aphorism: *Uluu tooğo chukkan barbi, ular ünün ukkan barbi?* “[Is there anybody who could reach the top of the great mountain and hear the voice of a black grouse?]”

Its English translation is as follows:

*75 They cry to their leader, who's heading them all – As if to some pretty young maiden they call.*

Here, the word “**ular**” has been interpreted from the Turkic language as the third person plural pronoun “they”, but not as a bird. That is the mistake of the translator who did not pay enough attention to it as well as to its cultural aspect.

### **b) a person acquires the features and qualities of a bird:**

2119 *küvezlik bile kükke agmaz kişi*

küväzlik bilä kökkä agmas kişi – “[lit: a person with pride will not rise to the skies].”

2119 *For pride cannot rise to the height haughty men.*

According to what has been said above we may come to the following conclusion:

**I.** Semantic types of metaphor do not influence the process of translation. Such semantic transferences are typical for all existing languages.

**II.** In the process of comparing the original text with its English translation by W. May some linguistic and extra linguistic factors which may influence the

adequate translation of semantic types of metaphors have been identified together with cultural aspects of the definite words.

### **Personification in The *Kutadgu Bilig***

If a Metaphor involves likeness between inanimate and animate objects, we also deal with Personification. For instance:

5867 *biri ivse biri amulluk tiler / biri külse biri sıgtıka ular*

(*biri ivse biri amulluk tiler* – if one is in hurry, another wishes peace) (OTD; 42) / if one of them laughs, another one cries)

Ivanov translates it the following way:

5867 *Одной любо медлить, другой – мчатся вскачь,  
Одна весела, а в другой – боль и плач.*

5867 *One likes to delay, and the next likes to speed,  
One likes to be merry, the next weeps indeed.*

Here we would like to give a brief note to mentioned couplets. According to ancient Oriental medicine, there are four elements in a man's body which are different in colours: red is a blood, yellow – a bile, black – a decay, white – a mucus, humidity. Ancient medical law taught that upsetting the balance between them resulted in sickness, or physical and spiritual indisposition. This statement coincides with the theory of Hippocrat about the four body «juices» and, accordingly, about the four kinds of temper: sanguine person – mirrors blood; phlegmatic person- mucus; choleric subject – yellow bile; melancholic person – black bile.

Apart from these, there are numerous cases of employing Personification in the **Kutadgu Bilig**: couplets 5828, 5670, 1850, 1851, 1852, 3949, 403, 404, 3880, etc. Moreover, the first semantic group of metaphors in the “Metaphor” section of the present paper, where the animation of inanimate objects is analysed can also refer to this kind of stylistic device.

### **Metonymy in The *Kutadgu Bilig***

As it is known Metonymy is based on a different type of relation between the dictionary and contextual meaning. “Metonymy reflects the actually existing relations between two objects and is based on their contiguity.” (Kukharensko, 1971: 25) Since the types of relation between two objects can be finally limited they are observed again and again, and Metonymy in most cases is trite (f. eg. to earn one's bread). “Genuine Metonymy reveals a quite unexpected substitution of one word for another on the ground of some strong impression produced by a feature of the thing or material” (Galperin, 1971: 132)

**For instance in the couplet 1926 from KB:**

*hazine urunsa kümüş hem ağı  
yağı boynı yençse kiterse çoğı*

(Ağı – jewellery, treasures, gifts: qazina uzasa kümüş ham ağı – Let the Treasury be increased “lengthened” with silver and gold OTD; 17); it bends the foes and enriches the Treasury).

*И чтобы казна богатела бы златом,  
И шеи пришлось бы склонить супостатам* (1926)

*And how fill the Treasury, then, with rich gold,  
And whip all the wolves, then, away from the fold.* (1926) W. M.

Here, we would like to mention about chapter 67 “Odgurmysh tells how to scorn temptation, and take what is.” In this very chapter there are many cases of employing Metonymy is found. They are: 4683, 4684, 4765, 4767, 4768, 4769 etc. **For example:**

4765 *tonum koy yungı tap yigüm arpa aş  
tükel boldı dünya manga ay kadaş*

(*tonum qoj jüngı tap jeğüm arpa aş* – (for) cloth it’s enough to have sheep fleece for me, and for food some barley) (OTD; 453)

**In Russian translation:**

4765 *Овчина – покров мой, ячмень мне – еда,  
И мной бранный мир позабыт навсегда.*

4765 *A sheepskin’s my cover, and barley my bread.  
All else in this world is forgotten instead.*

The difference between Metaphor and Metonymy, as known, is very subtle. Another matter is that “The scope of transference in Metonymy is much more limited than that in Metaphor, – writes V. Kukhareenko, – which is quite understandable: the scope of human imagination identifying two objects (phenomena, actions) on the grounds of commonness of one of their innumerable characteristics is boundless while actual relation between objects are more limited.” (Кухаренко, 1980: 53)

E. Aznaurova considers that fixed associations lie in the basis of Metonymy. “However, she writes, unlike associations caused by the context or by potentially permanent for the certain types of relations: items of clothing – person, parts of body – person, etc.” (Азнаурова, 1973: 20)

### III. Stylistic Devices Based on Interaction Between the Logical and Emotive Meanings of a Word

The emotive meaning or emotional colouring of a word plays a considerable role in Stylistics. An utterance cannot be understood clearly without evaluation of the author's attitude towards the things described.

#### Epithet in The *Kutadgu Bilig*

Epithet is as well-known as Metaphor because it is widely mentioned by critics, scholars and teachers. Its basic feature is emotiveness and subjectivity and it has remained over the centuries the most widely used stylistic device. The frequency of employing Epithets in the *Kutadgu Bilig* is very high.

Here we will pay attention to epithets defining nouns. In the KB there are not so many epithets of Arabic and Persian origin. They are: *yayıg dünya* "changeable world" (1073, 3533, 4730, 5925, 6152, 6230); *keçki/keçer dünya* "passing world" (3087, 3782, 5405, 6563); *alçı ajun* "deceptive world" (5231) etc.

There are many epithets in the *Kutadgu Bilig* with the words "köñül" and "söz":

**a) köñli bai** – "a rich soul (heart)"; "to be rich at heart": 3613, 2620.

3613 *çıgay erse nengke közi köñli bay* – [The richness he showed of his eyes and his heart]

3613 *Rich at heart, keen of eye, he his sense did evince.* (W. M.)

**b) köñli tok** – ("satisfied soul"; "full soul") in the meaning of "be noble" in the couplets: 2690, 2885, 5388:

2885 *bütün çın bagırsak közi köñli tok* – [extremely devoted, rich at his eye and heart]

2885 *He must be faithful, no evil must know.* (W. M.)

As we can see, there is no metaphor in the couplet.

**c) köñli tırig** – "a live soul or heart" in the meaning of "be generous"; "be gentle" in the couplets: 3073, 603, 4910, 5772:

3073 *kişi köñli tırlür bolur kızgu eng* - [a man's soul starts living ...]

3073 *His brow is enlightened, his soul is not stained!* (W. M.)

The next semantic type of Epithets consists of metaphorized combinations whereas inanimate objects acquire the features of inanimate ones.

This type is seen more often in the KB. It mostly involves abstract concepts such as *bilig* – "mind" and *söz* – "word":

a) the metaphorical combination *bilgi kojug* – “deep knowledge” in the couplets 3382, 3829:

3382 *ne edgü bilig birdi bilgi koyug* [what a wonderful knowledge (the man) with deep knowledge gave] (QBK 196) (OTD; 453).

3382 The sense of this speech is, of course, hidden deep: (W. M.)

b) *bilgi buçuk* (half minded). *Biligi biçuq*. – [just half of the mind] in the couplet 4020:

4020 *bu söz tutmaz erning biligi biçuk* – [the man who doesn’t keep his word, has just half of his mind] (QBN; 290) (OTD; 105).

4021 *If his words don’t make sense, then your mind must be sere.* (W. M.)

The next group of metaphors is collected from the metaphorical combinations with the word *söz* - “word”. For instance: *irik söz* - “a rude word”; “to be rude (to)” in the couplets (3426, 3430, 3846, 3847, 5773, 5774, 5775, 4303); *jumşak söz* - “a kind word”, “restrain” in (703, 2665, 2749, 3426, 464); *süçik söz* - “a sweet word” (4280, 4348, 1696, 2072, 2576, 2665, 4307).

3426 *irig sözke yumşak yanut kılsa öz  
açık sözleseler süçig tutsa söz.*

Erig sözkä jumşaq janut qılsa öz – [a sweet reply should be given to rude words] (OTD; 279).

3426 *If one is rough-tongued, be restrained, don’t break in.  
His bitter reproaches with sweet words answer him.* (W. M.)

**Or the couplet 3430 says:**

*irig sözlemegil kişike tilin  
irig sözke agrır köngül kiç bilin*

Erig sözlämägil kişika tilin/erig sözkä agrır köngül keç bilin – [Don’t say rude words to anyone,/The soul is hurt from it for a very long years] (QBN; 200); (OTD; 19)

**The English translation of the couplet is:**

3430 *Your tongue from offensive words fully restrain;  
From offence in one’s soul comes unending sharp pain.*

a) *bışık söz*- “decision” (literally: a cooked word) “final word” (3842);

3842 *ayur sözle keltür sözüngni bışıg*

*sözlä keltüz sözüngni bışıg* - speak about your final decision (QBN; 278); (OTD; 106)

According to Walter May's translation he does not even mention about "word":

3843 *Tell me all you know, as I long have desired!* (W. M.)

**b) *isig söz*** – (*lit.*: a hot word) - "be affable, friendly, cordial" (522, 2405, 2408, 2478, 2479, 6095):

2405 *isig söz küler yüz bile birgü neng*

2405 *Be kindly, and open, and spoil freely share.*

**c) *uşak söz*** – "gossips". *Uşaq söz edür* – to gossip, tittle-tattle.

4301 *uşak söz ederme yime kikneme*

*uşaq söz edärmä jemä kegnämä* – don't gossip and fly into a rage [with them] (OTD; 617).

4302 Don't scold other folk, nor offend them with lies.

From the examples given before we can see that different abstract concepts (wit, knowledge) are acquired by the features of concrete objects and phenomena. Hence, 'words' also acquire the same qualities: **rude word; coarse word – *irig söz*** (roughness, coarseness; crudity, rudeness); endearing words, kind words – ***jumşak söz*** (kindness); sweet word – ***süçig söz*** (gratefulness, jocundity, pleasantness); final word – ***bışig söz*** – (last word); kind word – ***isig söz*** (affability, friendliness, amiability); gossips – ***uşak söz*** (to gossip, tittle-tattle); ***java söz*** – false, lie words; etc.

**This comparatively typological analysis of stylistic devices in the Kutadgu Bilig defines following conclusions:**

1. A careful analysis of SDs in the Kutadgu Bilig is absolutely necessary because of translation problems. Incorrect translation in the system of literary works causes distortion of the meaning of the whole text.

In order to reproduce the definite SD in KB adequately in English, it is necessary to keep some conditions:

2. SDs have a series of universal typologic characteristics and peculiarities in the considered languages into which the poem has been translated.

3. It has been proved that direct correlation between all the elements of style can be found in ST and TT.

## REFERENCE

1. Arat, R. R., (1991), **Kutadgu Bilig**. 3 – baskı: Ankara.
2. Galperin, I. R., (1971), **Stylistics**. M.: Higher School.
3. Prescott, F.C., (1953), **The Poetic Mind**. New-York.

4. Ларин, Б. А., (1974), **Эстетика слова и язык писателя**. Л., «Худ. литература»
5. Geniusas, (1972), **A Digest of Style**. Riga
6. Квятковский, А., (1966), **Поэтический словарь**. М., «Сов. энциклопедия»
7. Kukhareno, V., (1986), **A Book of Practice in Stylistics**. Moscow.
8. Kukhareno, V., (1971), **Seminars in Style**. Moscow
9. Кухаренко, В., (1980), **Индивидуально- художественный стиль и его исследование**. Киев-Одесса
10. Азнаурова, Е., (1973), **Очерки по стилистике слова**. Ташкент
11. Saeed, J., (2003), **Semantics**. 2-nd Ed., Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
12. Yusuf Balasaguni. (1998), **Beneficent knowledge** / English Transl. Walter May. М.
13. **Древнетюркский словарь**.(1969), Л.: Наука.
14. Коптилов, В. В., (1972), **Оригинал и перевод. Раздумья и наблюдения**. Киев.
15. Потебня, А., (1990), **Теоретическая поэтика**. М. Гачечиладзе, Г., (1972), **Художественный перевод и литературные взаимосвязи**. М.
16. Баласагунский, Ю., (1990), **Благодатное знание**. Л., Сов. Писатель.